26

27

28

1	TAMARA BEATTY PETERSON, ESQ., Bar No. 5218 tpeterson@petersonbaker.com	
2	NIKKI L. BAKER, ESQ., Bar No. 6562 nbaker@petersonbaker.com	
3	PETERSON BAKER, PLLC 10001 Park Run Drive	
4	Las Vegas, NV 89145 Telephone: 702.786.1001 Facsimile: 702.786.1002	
5	L. LIN WOOD, ESQ. (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)	
6	lwood@linwoodlaw.com NICOLE JENNINGS WADE, ESQ. (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)	
7	nwade@linwoodlaw.com G. TAYLOR WILSON, ESQ. (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) twilson@linwoodlaw.com L. LIN WOOD, P.C. 1180 West Peachtree Street, Suite 2400 Atlanta, Georgia 30309 Telephone: 404.891.1402 Facsimile: 404.506.9111	
8		
9		
10		
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff Steve Wynn	
12		
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
14	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
15	STEVE WYNN, an individual,	Case No.: 2:18-cv-00609-JCM-GWF
16	Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATION AND
17	LISA BLOOM, an individual; and THE	ORDER RE: EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PLAINTIFF TO FILE RESPONSE TO
18	BLOOM FIRM, a California Professional Corporation,	DEFENDANTS' SPECIAL MOTION TO DISMISS
19	Defendants.	(First Request)
2021		
22	D1 : .: 00 G	
23	Plaintiff Steve Wynn (" Mr. Wynn "), by and through his attorneys of record, Tamara Beatty	
	Peterson, Esq. and Nikki L. Baker, Esq., of Peterson Baker, PLLC, and L. Lin Wood, Esq., Nicole	
24	Jennings Wade, Esq., and G. Taylor Wilson, Esq., of L. Lin Wood, P.C., and Defendants Lisa	
25	Bloom and The Bloom Firm (collectively, the "Bloom Defendants"), by and through their	

attorneys of record, Marc J. Randazza, Esq., Ronald D. Green, Esq., and Alex J. Shepard, Esq., of

the Randazza Legal Group, PLLC, hereby agree and stipulate, subject to the Court's approval, as

follows:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 1. On April 5, 2018, Mr. Wynn filed his "Complaint for Defamation" [ECF No. 1] against the Bloom Defendants based on a press release they issued accusing Mr. Wynn of improper acts relating to a former dancer in the Wynn Las Vegas show, "ShowStoppers."
- 2. On May 8, 2018, the Bloom Defendants filed their "Answer and Affirmative Defenses" [ECF No. 16].
- 3. On May 15, 2018, the Bloom Defendants filed a "Special Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to NRS 41.660" [ECF No. 18] and a "Request for Judicial Notice in Support of Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment Invoking the Substantive Portions of the Nevada Anti-SLAPP Statute, NRS 41.635 et seq." [ECF No. 19] (collectively, the "anti-SLAPP Motion").
- 4. In support of the anti-SLAPP Motion, the Bloom Defendants submitted twenty-five (25) exhibits. (See ECF No. 18-2—18-27.) Six (6) of their exhibits are declarations, four (4) of which are from third party witnesses testifying to facts purportedly bearing on the truth of the statements at issue in this action and the knowledge of the Bloom Defendants regarding same.
- 5. Pursuant to Local Rule 7-2(b), the Clerk's Office's docket states that Mr. Wynn's response to the anti-SLAPP Motion is due on May 29, 2018.
- 6. Mr. Wynn and the Bloom Defendants (collectively referred to, where appropriate, as the "Parties") have not yet held a Rule 26(f) conference. Mr. Wynn's response to the anti-SLAPP Motion is due prior to the deadline to hold any Rule 26(f) conference.
- 7. Following receipt of the anti-SLAPP Motion, Mr. Wynn's counsel informed the Bloom Defendants' counsel that Mr. Wynn intended to file a Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(d) motion to conduct limited and necessary discovery, in the possession of the Bloom Defendants and third parties, relevant to responding to the allegations in the anti-SLAPP Motion relating to falsity and actual malice and, to this end, sought an extension of the deadline to file Mr. Wynn's response to the anti-SLAPP Motion.
- 8. The Parties are currently attempting to agree on the discovery Mr. Wynn may conduct relating to the anti-SLAPP Motion consistent with Rule 56(d). If the Parties are unable to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

reach an agreement on all discovery sought by Mr. Wynn, Mr. Wynn will file a Rule 56(d) motion with the Court on the disputed discovery.

- 9. To provide sufficient time for the Parties to brief and the Court to issue a decision on any Rule 56(d) motion, the deadline for Mr. Wynn to file his response to the anti-SLAPP Motion is extended as follows: (a) if the Court grants all or part of the Rule 56(d) motion, on the date set by the Court's order; or (b) if the Court denies the Rule 56(d) motion in its entirety, within fourteen (14) days after entry of the Court's order.
- 10. If, however, the Parties are able to agree upon the limited discovery Mr. Wynn may conduct, the Parties will submit a stipulation and proposed order to the Court for approval, which, among other things, sets forth the stipulated discovery, sets a deadline to complete this discovery, and establishes a reasonable briefing scheduling for Mr. Wynn's response to the anti-SLAPP Motion and the Bloom Defendants' reply in support of the anti-SLAPP Motion.
- 11. In order to "secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination" (see Fed. R. Civ. P. 1) of the anti-SLAPP Motion and consistent with NRS 41.660(3)(e), a partial stay of discovery is appropriate. In this regard, the Parties' obligation to hold a Rule 26(f) conference, submit a stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order pursuant to Local Rule 26-1(a), and commence discovery is stayed pending a decision by the Court on the anti-SLAPP Motion, except for limited discovery stipulated to by the Parties and/or permitted by the Court in response to any Rule 56(d) motion filed by Mr. Wynn.
- 12. Pending the filing of and decision on any Rule 56(d) motion, the Bloom Defendants will permit Mr. Wynn to engage in certain agreed upon discovery concerning the facts raised by the anti-SLAPP Motion.
- 13. In light of the foregoing, the Parties submit that good cause exists for the Court to approve this Stipulation, and respectfully request that, as set forth herein, the Court extend the time

//

- 26 //
- 27

PETERSON BAKER, PLLC

27

28